

United States can compete with steel produced anywhere in the world on quality and cost. Yes, we must pass legislation before we go home.

#### STILL NO RESPONSE FROM THE SENATE ON ECONOMIC SECURITY

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have passed an economic security package to create new jobs and help unemployed workers. But the stalling economy continues to be in jeopardy because of the legislative process which continues to stall economic security legislation.

What are we waiting for? A stock market crash? Two-dollar-per-gallon gasoline? The failure to prepare and respond with sound initiatives to aid the economy indicates a disturbing disconnect between the elected officials and the state of the union.

The unemployment rate rose to its highest level in 6 years. Yet the leadership in Congress is constructing roadblocks and sitting on legislation to get the economy out of recession. More Americans lost their jobs last month, yet the legislative process refuses to respond with a plan of recovery.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get the economic security act moving. It is time to get serious and match the House's work.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY LIFE

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a wonderful organization named Family Life. Since the tragic events of September 11, there have been numerous stories of couples seeking assistance in reconciling their differences and continuing their commitment to each other. Many of these couples have sought out the assistance of Family Life.

For 25 years, Family Life, under the leadership of Dennis Rainey, has been helping struggling relationships become happy unions again. Formed as a means to provide Campus Crusade staff members premarriage seminars, community leaders and pastors soon learned of the group and encouraged them to provide their blueprint on how to build strong homes to the general public.

Since then, more than 1 million people have attended Family Life conferences and even more have used their materials. At the heart of Family Life is a lay volunteer network of more than 10,000 couples. Many are helping Family Life reach couples as city ministers or by leading study groups. With their help, Family Life has blossomed into a very effective support network for families, one home at a time.

In honor of their hard work and dedication, Governor Huckabee proclaimed this week will be Family Life Week in Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my governor in recognizing the importance of the family unit and the service that Family Life has provided to preserve this cornerstone of society.

#### HONORING STUDENTS FROM MOLALLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special group of students from Molalla Elementary School. Like the rest of America, these girls and boys were shocked by the attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. After a great deal of brainstorming, they agreed to raise \$1,000 to send to the Families of Freedom scholarship fund which has been set up by former President Bill Clinton and former Senator Bob Dole. This fund will provide education assistance for postsecondary education to financially needy relatives of those killed or permanently disabled as a result of the terrorist attacks.

I know that the students worked extremely hard to raise the \$1,000. Some of them, I know, made great sacrifices to do this. I am so proud to represent the students of Molalla Elementary and thank them for their generous, heartwarming gift.

#### ECONOMIC SECURITY NOW

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, last week I wrote the leader of the other body a letter. Today I call on the majority leader in the other body to schedule a vote on the economic stimulus and security package immediately. There is no greater need in America today than to put people back to work in good jobs. People are hurting, unemployment is rising, and now we have proof that the economy is in recession. What more evidence does the leadership in the other body need? The American people deserve action on this now. It is time to put partisanship aside and work together to turn our economy around.

The Democratic leadership in the other body failed to push through a strictly partisan version of a stimulus plan on November 14. Despite including big subsidies for chicken manure and bison burgers, the other leadership did not even consider President Bush's plan to accelerate tax relief for at least 34 million American workers.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve action on this now. It is time for the other body to stop stalling and pass an economic security/stimulus plan.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Members are reminded by the Chair not to encourage or discourage action by the other body.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

Mr. HINCHEY of New York.

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2883, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 312 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 312

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 312 is a standard rule that allows the House to consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 2883, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. The rule waives all points of order against the consideration of the conference report. The rule is the normal rule we have for conference reports.

The intelligence authorization bill is a critical piece of legislation in any average year, but this year, given the recent September 11 tragedies and the war we are waging against terrorism as we speak, it is absolutely essential that we get this bill to the President's desk without any further delay. As Members are aware, the National Security Act requires that Congress authorize each dollar the U.S. spends on intelligence and intelligence-related activities. We are unique in that respect. The war on terrorism means that there has

been a fundamental shift in intelligence and defense priorities, as the President has stated, and these authorities must be reflected in law.

While we will discuss the conference report in greater detail during the general debate, I would like to highlight a few of the ways that the legislation will tackle both critical counterterrorism challenges as well as the long-term problems facing America's intelligence community.

The conference report increases funding for foreign language capability. Obviously this is a critical requirement in the fight against terrorism because it is all over the world and we need the language capability. It certainly is also a basic, core competency for our intelligence community. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has pushed this issue for several years and we are going to continue to push it in the future until we get better results.

Another core intelligence capability this conference report bolsters is human intelligence. In addition to providing the necessary resources for this, the conference report includes a version of the House language directing the Director of Central Intelligence to repeal the so-called Deutch 1995 guidelines on the recruitment of human sources. These guidelines may have been issued with the best of intentions, and no doubt were, but in practice, they have had a chilling effect on our ability to gain vital intelligence from sources with access to unsavory characters, particularly such as terrorists.

Finally, this conference report includes a House provision requiring an accounting from the Director of Central Intelligence concerning whether and to what extent the intelligence community has implemented the recommendations of the Bremer, the Hart-Rudman and the Gilmore commissions. All of those were reports on terrorism and the vulnerabilities and threats to our security and the security of Americans at home and abroad. As Members are aware, these independent commissions examined the United States' measures for prevention of and preparedness for terrorist attacks. All of the provisions are essentially components to the health of the intelligence community and our country.

I urge the House to adopt the rule and embrace the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague from Florida for yielding me the time. It is a pleasure for me to serve with Chairman GOSS on both the Committee on Rules and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2883, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. H. Res. 252 is a modified open rule requiring

that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, Mr. Speaker, the preprinting requirement has been the accepted practice for a number of years because of the sensitive nature of much of the bill and the need to protect its classified documents. The bill is not controversial and was reported from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by a unanimous vote.

Members who wish to do so, and I urge Members to pay attention to this, can go to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Office to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the programs and activities of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the national intelligence program, which includes the Central Intelligence Agency as well as the foreign intelligence and counterintelligence programs within, among others, the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the Departments of State, Treasury and Energy and the FBI.

□ 1115

Also included in the classified documents are the authorizations for the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities and Joint Military Intelligence Program of the Department of Defense. Members can go to the committee and review those matters.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House considered and passed the authorization for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002. The intelligence bill we consider today is another critical component in our national defense. Today, more than ever, we need to be vigilant about the myriad threats to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, while there will be debate on some worthy amendments, this is a noncontroversial bill providing authorizations for important national security programs. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 312 just passed, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to rule XXII, the conference report is considered having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 6, 2001, at page H9057).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the conference report before us. Before I begin the main part of my statement, let me first acknowledge and thank the Members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, each and every one of them, but especially our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for hard work, dedication, showing up and doing the business that needed to be done, and doing it intelligently and with a good deal of thoughtfulness.

I also want to specifically thank the committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their untiring efforts that have gotten us to this point. I very much appreciate the way they work in a nonpartisan way.

Obviously, I need to thank the Senate Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Members and their staffs as well, especially under the steady hand of the chairman, my good friend, Senator GRAHAM, and the vice chairman, my good friend, Senator SHELBY. We appreciate the efforts they have put in.

Mr. Speaker, by definition a conference is a time when the two bodies come together to settle whatever differences there may be between the bills, often including resolution of differences of opinion and viewpoints on how money is needed, how it should be spent, what laws should be changed, what direction the administration should go, those kinds of things. But in this case, we are talking about protecting our Nation's security at a time when this is very much in the forefront of everybody's attention.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, this conference found very, very few differences of opinion between the two bodies, and, frankly, between the points of view on either side of the aisle, on these and other areas. When it comes to national security, we seem to be pulling together very strongly in the area of intelligence.

Let me briefly review some of the areas of agreement. First, intelligence is our first line of defense; and it must be treated as such, especially on our war on terrorism, one of the new transnational threats we are, regrettably, beginning to understand a lot better. Although it may get lost in the continuous CNN optic of the coverage going on in Afghanistan and the Pentagon releases of bombs exploding and troops on the move, none of the activity that is actually happening would be possible without good intelligence.

Second, there are four key areas where the administration and Congress must immediately address themselves

if we are to properly protect the country's rights and freedoms. They are revitalizing the National Security Agency and the signals intelligence system, upon which we have had such wonderful production and service over the years and now needs upgrading; correcting deficiencies in conducting and collecting human intelligence, a matter which we all understand very well, something we cannot do without; providing a more appropriate balance between intelligence collection and analysis to better achieve a global awareness capability, something we have been talking about for years; and rebuilding a robust research and development program across the intelligence communities.

We have been so lucky and so well helped by the innovation and creativity that our country produces and the applications we have been able to use in the intelligence community over the last 50 years, and we need to have more of that in the days ahead.

There are other areas of concern besides these four, but these are the most critical for the types of threats that we face now and that we are going to face, we think, over the next few years; and they are certainly the areas that we are in full agreement with the other body on.

Thirdly, the intelligence community has got to be better focused on strategic intelligence and better positioned to be able to get access to so-called plans and intentions, that is, what is going on in the minds of the evil-doers, the mischief makers, in order to prevent the crisis. We do not want to be just great at sweeping up after the tragedy; we want to stop the tragedy before it happens. In short, we must have an intelligence community culture that is less risk averse.

My last example is that the conferees believe that any effort to invest in and expand intelligence capabilities, and such efforts clearly must be made, will only be marginally successful if it does not also include provision for a more appropriate management structure for the intelligence community. We are talking here basic architecture and the appropriate management overlay to make the system work.

Today's intelligence structure is insufficient for today's and tomorrow's challenges. We know it, and we have to get about the job of dealing with that; and I am pleased that the administration is taking up that challenge. We look forward to working with the President and his administration on these issues. They simply cannot wait.

Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that there were not differences between the bodies during our conference. There were. I am happy to report that there were few and that they were worked out successfully and the result is a conference report that was approved by a vast bipartisan majority of the conferees. There are a couple of areas where I would have liked things to have turned out differently personally,

but that did not happen; and in the spirit of compromise, I am happy to support what I think is a very good conference report which will serve this country well. Again, I commend my colleagues for working in that spirit.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we paused to remember the 3-month anniversary of the horrible and tragic attacks on America by the terrorists, those the President has referred to as the "evil-doers." Also on Monday we laid to rest the first combat casualty of our war on terrorism, Mike Spann.

The fact that the first casualty was a CIA officer speaks to the fact that intelligence is in fact in the lead in this war. There is no argument about that. But some have questioned how our Nation got into this position, how these attacks could have occurred in the first place; and frankly, there is no easy answer to that question, as there are many facets.

For one thing, terrorists took advantage of the basic rights and freedoms that we so openly and charitably give to our citizens and visitors alike in this country. They abused those privileges.

Another point is that communications between the entities and agencies assigned the responsibility for protecting our borders was simply not adequate. We know that.

But there is also certainly an intelligence story here. Put simply, we do not have an intelligence community that is properly structured to collect the types of intelligence that would have prevented such attacks had the information been available. In part, this is of our own doing as a country and a Congress.

After the Cold War, a decision was made to "build down" intelligence. Many thought that we were at peace, perhaps this would be part of the peace dividend. We did not have a single major threat that people really could identify, and we could afford to spend intelligence monies elsewhere. Congress acted. Money was shifted, indeed.

Beginning in the 104th Congress, the Intelligence Committees of Congress on both sides, both Houses and both sides of the aisle, recognized the risks of the looming threats of transnational issues and year after year attempted to put more investment into intelligence. However, the administration's efforts were more focused on domestic issues and had little interest in that kind of investment at that time. Consequently, we ended up with a much-reduced intelligence capability, less access around the world, and a risk-averse environment, and, frankly, a growing threat.

This is not to say that those brave men and women in the rank and file of the intelligence community were not doing their jobs. They were playing the hand they were dealt, and they were doing very well under the circumstances. This is also not to say that Congress was not aware of the risks. We certainly were, and we talked about them a lot.

Recently, I had occasion to review the intelligence bills and conference reports since the 104th Congress. In the 104th Congress, we noted that there was a growing threat and a growing vulnerability to terrorism. We sent that message. We talked about the need to share information better between intelligence and law enforcement. Remember, this is back in the 104th Congress. We talked about the need to invest more robustly in intelligence resources.

Then in the 105th Congress we noted that the intelligence community must "keep a watchful eye on the areas that are likely to be tomorrow's crises." I would point out that we mentioned the transnational threats.

We also mentioned that our national security was being affected by a broader set of issues that have not been identified with our global interests. We needed to rebuild our intelligence capabilities, and we expressed concern over the growing apathy toward national security and intelligence.

Again these issues were raised in the 106th Congress, where we stated that there was a growing possibility that a rogue nation or group would acquire the ability to attack U.S. interests with nuclear, biological, chemical, or some other weapon of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I am not pointing these facts out to say "we told you so." Far from it. The point is that we must engage with this administration now, and we must put significant effort into quickly rebuilding our intelligence capabilities. We cannot wait. The events of September 11, sadly, stand as a reminder of what happens when we let our intelligence guard down.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a good start toward rebuilding what the Nation needs. But it is only a start. It is a snapshot in time. Many of us refer to it as the first year of a 5-year plan. We look forward to working with the administration to secure our national freedom. We look forward to working in a nonpartisan way to do this with the passage of this conference report. I am fully supportive of the report. I encourage its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our chairman has very well explained how we got to the point we are at today. I want to commend him for the leadership he has provided to the committee, not only at the conference meeting but throughout what has turned out to be a very challenging year. I thank the chairman.

The House version of the intelligence authorization bill came to the floor a little over 3 weeks after the terrorist attacks on New York City, Washington, and Pennsylvania. Active and retired intelligence community personnel were killed in the World Trade Center and at the Pentagon.

In the weeks since, the United States has begun to strike back at those who

were involved in the September attacks, and at those who support them. On Monday, the first combat fatality of the struggle against terrorism in Afghanistan was buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Mike Spann was a CIA officer. We eulogized him yesterday on this floor with the suspension vote in the presence of his family: his wife, Shannon; his parents, and his children.

Timely and reliable intelligence, as we know, is crucial to the successful conclusion of this campaign, and it is already clear that intelligence officers will be deeply involved, at home and in the field, in the difficult and dangerous job of ensuring that our policymakers and military commanders have the information on which they will increasingly depend.

The emergency supplemental appropriations bill passed in the wake of the September attacks provided a large amount of additional resources for intelligence programs and activities. This conference report provides more; substantially more, than was provided last year, and significantly more than was requested by the President.

Our chairman has gone over some of the priorities in the bill, and I want to associate myself with those. That would be human intelligence capabilities that he talked about and TPED, the tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination of intelligence. It is very important for us to put more resources there. Another priority for us in the bill was the investment in advanced research and development projects necessary to keep pace with changes in technology, and, of course, the technology necessary to improve the process of collecting and processing intelligence.

Some of these funds that are in this bill will continue improvements as the chairman emphasized, in our human intelligence capabilities, to ensure that case officers receive the kind of training they need, particularly in foreign languages, to enable them to do their jobs effectively.

□ 1130

Some of these funds will make investments in the kinds of systems required if agencies like the National Security Agency and the National Reconnaissance Office are to keep pace with rapid technological change. The modernization of NSA remains a top priority of the committee and measurable progress is expected in the coming year. As steadfast as the committee has been in advocating more spending on intelligence, it must now be equally engaged in conducting the kind of oversight necessary to make certain that these additional funds are spent efficiently on programs that will really make a difference, not only in the current effort against terrorism, but on the demands of an uncertain future as well.

Although I am satisfied with the disposition made by the conferees on most

of the items which separated the two bodies, I was disappointed with the resolution of the provision in the House bill which would have established an independent commission to review the Nation's security posture immediately preceding September 11. Our colleagues in the other body insisted that the two intelligence committees could undertake an inquiry into the readiness of the intelligence community, and other committees of jurisdiction could examine the other elements of the executive branch.

The issue was never whether the committees had the resources to do this job, it was whether it made sense for them to do it. I am concerned that an independent review would have had credibility with the American people that a congressional review, no matter how professionally done, will not.

The House version of the bill, when it left our committee stated, Mr. Speaker, "The committee believes that the Commission will only be successful if it is seen to be truly independent of any preconceived notions about the effectiveness of the activities of the departments and agencies it will review. Appointing members with a reputation for challenging conventional wisdom, wide perspective, bold and innovative thought, and broad experience in dealing with complex problems will contribute directly to instilling the Commission with an independence of spirit which will enhance the credibility of its work."

It goes on further. I want to put these words on the record. This body chose to modify the Commission and change its nature, but when we got to the conference, the Commission was eliminated all together. I want to put on the record the spirit of independence that I hoped the review would have.

This is not about fingerpointing or assigning blame; it really is more about understanding whatever government shortcomings may have contributed to the events of September 11. An independent inquiry will one day be commissioned, I am certain, although perhaps without the congressional input that we tried to do in our committee.

We need to know if there were gaps and where they were, again, not to assess blame, but to be sure that they are addressed. Our constituents must have confidence that an assessment of future needs is based on solid judgments about past performance. This will be especially important if we are to consider changing the structure of the intelligence community, and that is the challenge our chairman and our committee will have in the next year. Some of these reforms may be called for by President Bush, as is his right.

On another important issue the conference report more faithfully reflects the position of the House, and that was a compromise that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) took the lead in shaping and I was pleased to sup-

port. It was necessary because in 1995, in response to concerns that there was insufficient CIA headquarters involvement in decisions to recruit as assets individuals with poor records of respecting human rights or the law, guidelines were issued to ensure that senior officials were aware of and approved, certain recruitments. The intent of these guidelines was to protect relatively junior officers in the field from later charges that they acted unilaterally, and unwisely, in entering into relationships with certain individuals. Despite repeated assurances to the committee from high-level intelligence officials of two administrations that the guidelines had not prevented the recruitment of a single, identifiable, worthwhile asset, concerns were raised that the bureaucratic process through which the guidelines were administered was so time consuming that it provided a disincentive to case officers. This controversy has obscured the fact that encouraging a potential asset on a hard target, like a terrorist cell, to betray his or her country or cause is tremendously time consuming, difficult and dangerous. That we have had uneven success against these targets is more a reflection of those facts than it is the fault, in my view, of any guidelines.

Nevertheless, to make clear that Congress wants the recruitment process to be as aggressive as possible given the totality of the circumstances involved, the House approved a provision in the committee's bill which would have required a rescission of the existing guidelines and their replacement with new guidelines which achieve balance that "recognized concerns about egregious human rights behavior, but provides the much needed flexibility to seize upon opportunities as they present themselves." The House made clear that in striking this balance, "clearly there is a certain class of individuals who, because of their unreliability, instability, or nature of past misconduct, should be avoided." Again, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) led the way on this compromise that was in the House bill.

Although the DCI chose to rescind and reissue the guidelines before the legislative process was complete, the heart of the language which I was pleased to work with the gentleman from Nebraska on was retained in conference. The conferees want the current, more streamlined guidelines reviewed again to make certain that they provide appropriate encouragement to case officers to do their jobs well. As the statement of managers makes clear, however, whatever the results of that review, any guidelines issued "must balance concerns about human rights behavior and law-breaking" with the efforts to provide flexibility to take advantage of opportunities to gather information. That balance is the proper interpretation of the phrase "more appropriately weigh and incentivize risk" which appears in

clause (2) of section 403 of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, our President, when he came to the House on September 14, three days after the tragedy, said that we will bring the perpetrators of that tragedy to justice, or we will bring justice to them, but justice will be done. We want to be sure that our intelligence capabilities help the President reach that goal, a goal that we all share. Hopefully, this bill will take us closer to that.

I believe the conference agreement will contribute significantly to meeting the intelligence needs of the Nation, and I urge its adoption. I again associate myself with many of the remarks made by my chairman, particularly those about sharing of information by the FBI. Once again, I want to extend the sympathies of my constituents and I know all of our colleagues, to the family of Mike Spann and the Special Forces soldiers, the Green Berets who lost their lives. If I may, I would like to put their names in the RECORD also: Master Sergeant Jefferson Davis; Staff Sergeant Brian Cody Prosser; and Sergeant First Class Daniel Petithory. God bless them. God bless America.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the vice chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Member congratulates and commends the exemplary bipartisan effort of the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and his counterpart in the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM. I also want to extend my congratulations and appreciation to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for continuing to give us the leadership for a bipartisan conference report.

I rise, of course, in strong support of the conference report. Under the leadership of the people I have just mentioned, the legislative branch continues to move rapidly to address a number of long-standing deficiencies in our intelligence collection and analysis programs. The chairman's comments about the high quality work and dedication of the committee's first-rate staff are exactly on the mark, and I express my personal appreciation for their expertise, dedication, and hard work throughout the year.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the Select Permanent Committee on Intelligence has not suddenly awakened to the very real funding deficiencies and program matter inadequa-

cies of the intelligence agencies. For years, the intelligence committee has worked to reorient and enhance the effectiveness of the intelligence community and, of course, that has not received much public attention. But now, more than ever before, the American people understand through tragedy that our intelligence and counterterrorism programs are extremely important. As the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has frequently noted, "The message is not new; the audience for the message is now new."

I want to express my appreciation for the fact that he has gone back a few minutes ago to previous Congresses, back at least to the 104th Congress, to give some indication that the committee for some period of time has recognized and tried to address these transnational problems that are relatively new in the national focus.

Responsibly addressing the Nation's intelligence requirements now clearly has become a recognized national priority across the country in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attack. One result is a natural tendency to seek a simple solution, a quick fix. Certainly the conference report provides much-needed additional funds to improve our intelligence capabilities and to wage the war against terrorism, but at a more fundamental level, H.R. 2883 continues to aim even more aggressively to respond to serious underlying policy inadequacies and structural problems. I know all members of the committee would agree our work is not done, that we are looking forward to taking on this task during the next year.

In some cases, these are problems that have been years in the making and will take a number of years to reverse. For example, the conference report continues support for additional capacity in human intelligence collection. Human intelligence, or HUMINT, is the placement of highly-trained, language-capable officers in positions where they can acquire information vital to our national interests. Our HUMINT capacity was substantially downgraded in the years following the end of the Cold War. Also, our human intelligence collection efforts was understandably directed during the Cold War period at collection of the Soviet Union and its client states. Not in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, South Asia, and especially not in the problems of transnational terrorism and narcotics trafficking. The conference report continues this body's efforts at addressing these deficiencies and the new priorities.

Addressing another reason for the HUMINT inadequacies, this Member is particularly gratified that the conferees agreed to reverse the 1995 limitations on asset recruitment, and I especially appreciate the cooperation and assistance of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the committee in working with me, and the

chairman. These restrictions, called "the Deutsch guidelines," were promulgated as a means to limit our association with unsavory individuals, with human rights or other criminal problems. While the concerns underlying these guidelines were understandable, resulting from revelations about the problems of the 1970s and early 1980s, the reality is that the Deutsch guidelines have had a chilling effect on the recruitment of people who can actually and efficiently penetrate the inner circles of terrorist networks and narcotics rings. The recruitment of assets with unique knowledge or access to these terrorists and drug cartels is the key to successful HUMINT against these targets. The regrettable, real-world reality is that especially in the crucial battle against terrorism, we must allow our foreign officers to recruit assets that sometimes are rather unsavory characters. To win the war on terrorism, we have to end the cycle of risk aversion by our intelligence operatives and their superiors in headquarters. Recruiting Boy Scouts will not give us the penetration and intelligence we need.

In many cases, there will be difficult decisions to make, but the U.S. has professionals in the intelligence and law enforcement fields who can and must make those decisions. This conference report makes clear that our foreign intelligence personnel must recruit as agents those who possess the detailed and timely information which the United States needs to defend its people and its interests. Admittedly, there are risks with such recruited agents, but if the risks are realistically weighed against the benefits, the enhanced chances of operational success, this body must not rashly second-guess those decisions or fail to replace the Deutsch guidelines where they are detrimental to effective intelligence-gathering.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges adoption of the conference report on the intelligence authorization for fiscal year 2002.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, I rise in support of this conference report. It is a good work product. I want to thank and to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member, and especially our staff, who worked so hard and who did an extraordinary job to make sure that this package will serve to improve our country's ability to provide the best real-time information possible to our war-fighters and our policymakers, so as to protect Americans wherever they may be situated in the world.

The intelligence systems and activities that are funded by this conference report are a prominent and indispensable element of the war on terrorism. In the short time between September 11 and the time when the committee marked up the authorization bill, this committee worked extremely hard in a completely nonpartisan manner to develop proposals to correct shortfalls and to establish a basis for continued reform and innovation.

□ 1145

Most of these proposals are reflected in this conference report. The human element in this war on terrorism is fundamental, and it is an appropriate focus of our attention. But American technological prowess will greatly determine how effective our soldiers and intelligence officers will be, how many casualties our forces suffer, and how many innocent lives will be lost or protected.

The precision of our air campaign in Afghanistan is wondrous, and we must always remember that it depends as much on precise intelligence as on the guidance system of the missiles or the bombs. Developing these technical intelligence capabilities is expensive, and it is often difficult. Sometimes we make mistakes; but usually we, the government, and American industry get it right in the end. I am gratified to be part of this process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good start on correcting the problems in the intelligence community, but there is clearly much more that must be done. I speak, I believe, for all of my colleagues on the committee in again commending the chairman and our ranking member for their dedication, and also the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), my own counterpart, in assuring that our intelligence organizations can protect Americans against the new menace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), a distinguished member of our committee and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me, and I join in saluting American heroes who have given their lives in the fight against terrorism in the aftermath of September 11.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for their leadership in bringing this conference report to the House.

I also commend the hard work of our committee colleagues and staff, whose bipartisan approach attempts to ensure that this Nation has the best intelligence capabilities.

I love serving on this committee and as ranking member of the Sub-

committee on Terrorism and Homeland Security. It is a high honor, and it honors the constituents of California's 36th Congressional District, who design and build most of our Nation's intelligence satellites.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, President Bush spoke to 1,900 cadets at the Citadel and laid out three priorities for national defense: first, speeding the transformation of the military to face 21st century threats; second, protecting against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and third, strengthening our intelligence capability. All these goals are important, and I strongly support them.

This bill goes a long way toward accomplishing the third: this bill provides increased funding for human, technical, and tactical counterterrorist activities; it rescinds the CIA guidelines that may have restricted recruitment of some people with critical information on terrorist groups; and it requires the issuance of new guidelines to rebalance the recruitment process.

Also, it requires the administration to explain why it has not implemented the recommendations of three national commissions that studied terrorism and homeland security. I served on one of those commissions, the congressionally mandated Commission on Terrorism. All three produced good ideas that are still good today.

Our committee has served notice that it will do even more to push restructuring of the intelligence community next year; but meanwhile, this restructuring cannot happen in a vacuum. I believe the lesson learned from 9-11 is that good people had poor tools, and that our homeland security effort needs a leader with adequate power to conduct a unified threat assessment, develop a national plan, and compel agencies at all levels to share information and coordinate seamlessly to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism.

Governor Tom Ridge has this top job. Ridge is charged with coordinating all Federal efforts related to homeland security with those of State and local governments. The President's executive order also makes Ridge the chief communicator of homeland security policy.

Two months have passed since Tom Ridge started as director of the Office of Homeland Security; but in my view, he is losing power every day. He is a capable man with the skills and resume needed; but without the authority to influence Federal budgets, Ridge cannot enforce the changes that this committee has required and that this country needs. A bipartisan bill, H.R. 3026, would give him that authority.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I stated in a letter to the President on Monday, I continue to be concerned that the release of the new bin Laden videotape could prove damaging to American security. Those who do not believe bin Laden is guilty will not be persuaded by this tape. To me, the benefit of showing the tape is outweighed by the

risks that secret messages, signals, or facial expressions of bin Laden or in the background are embedded in the tape. I would have preferred that its distribution be limited to those with a need to know, possibly including foreign leaders.

But Mr. Speaker, returning to this conference report, it gives the right tools to good people in our intelligence community. I thank them for working 24-7 before and after September 11 to protect this country from terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong bipartisan support for this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who is also the chairman of our Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2883, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. Before I get to my statement, I wish to acknowledge the superb leadership, and I mean this very sincerely, of our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the Senate Intelligence Committee's chairman, Senator GRAHAM, and the vice chairman, Senator SHELBY. Their support and guidance brought the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence through a very difficult year, culminating in this fine piece of legislation. I think it is fitting to thank them for all of their efforts in support of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on a bill that authorizes spending for the Nation's intelligence organizations, operations, and the brave men and women, such as our fallen CIA officer Mike Spann, who are stationed all around the globe collecting and analyzing information to provide our true first line of defense.

Tragically, the events of September 11 have made crystal clear what many of us in the Congress have been saying for sometime, that we need to significantly improve our intelligence-gathering, analysis, and dissemination capabilities.

I do not for one moment blame the attacks in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania on an intelligence failure. Indeed, that blame can only be assigned to radical fanatics who would see America fall. But I do assign some blame on our collective lack of attention for maintaining a robust, properly resourced, and forward-leaning intelligence community that is not unduly restricted from collecting information on foreign threats to our country.

The authorization levels in this bill were determined by the conference committee as appropriate for beginning to rebuild our Nation's intelligence defenses. In the wake of 9-11, our intelligence organizations and



their professionals have been asked to do more than ever before, to provide more detailed information on an elusive but omnipresent enemy that directly threatens our country and our citizens.

Indeed, President Bush, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, Attorney General Ashcroft, and Director of Homeland Security Governor Ridge have all made statements about the increased need for and reliance upon our intelligence service in the wake of terrorist attacks.

There is no question in my mind that intelligence is now, more than ever, a critical function of national security worthy of this body's full funding support. It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my House colleagues to support this conference report. We elected Members of Congress have no greater duty to the people of the United States of America than to protect their safety, their freedoms, and their way of life.

To do that in a world populated with any number of terrorists who have no remorse for loss of American lives and property we must go on the offensive. We must discover and take action against the people who would do us harm.

That requires knowledge. Before the FBI can arrest a single al Qaeda member, the Bureau must know who and where that person is. Before a B-52 bomber can effectively drop a single bomb, its crew must be given the information on what target to attack. Before we can better defend against an intended terrorist attack, we need forewarning of the attack location and timing. All of these require intelligence, intelligence for national defense. There is no higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security.

(Mr. CONDIT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference committee today. This is a very powerful tool in arming our intelligence agency in a campaign against terrorism.

Though I am disappointed the conference report does not include an outside commission to assess our national security readiness since September 11, it is still a very good conference report. It does increase human intelligence, and it improves foreign language skills and translation capabilities.

We face an extraordinary challenge now to collect information and preserve our national security, and we must focus now on the security of our homeland. We cannot sit back and think about the future in the out years; we must address security needs now. This conference report does just that.

Yesterday, we passed a resolution honoring Johnny Spann, the first American to die in combat in Afghanistan. We pledged to continue to support our men and women, to ensure the safety to all of our citizens. This conference report makes good on that pledge.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate the chairman of the committee, as well as the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for this product, because I think it is a product that helps build a better and safer Nation. I congratulate them and thank them for their leadership.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis, and Counterintelligence, our subcommittee on hacking. I will let him explain what that stands for.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I thank the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), for bringing before this House what I feel is probably one of the best intelligence authorization conference report bills we have had in a long time. As a result, I do stand here in strong support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, since September 11, all Americans have witnessed, I believe, our intelligence community working at its best. America, unfortunately, did witness its first loss, our first combat loss of an American hero in our war on terrorism, CIA agent Johnny Mike Spann. Now we must provide the resources needed to combat terrorism at the most basic level for intelligence.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a good bill. It provides significant resources to the intelligence community which, during the last decade, went underfunded, understaffed, and underappreciated.

The 1990s were a risk-averse period during which the bullies of the world began to get the idea that the United States had gone soft and no longer had the will to defend American lives and American interests. The intelligence community often was not performing aggressively enough, though this was by no means the fault of the dedicated men and women who constitute the intelligence agencies' rank and file. They are now doing a terrific job, a wonderful job of catch-up, and they deserve the best support that we can give them.

Regarding today's needs, we are providing logistical and technical resources for a worldwide campaign to root out terrorism. Our intelligence officers are working on the ground in Afghanistan, as the American public is now very much aware, sadly aware, with the news of our fallen CIA hero.

What the American public will probably never know is that American intelligence officers are working around the clock worldwide to neutralize ter-

rorist cells and otherwise diminish the possibility of future attacks on innocent American citizens.

As for the needs and future needs, this bill provides resources for greater foreign language expertise, increased specialized training, increased analytical expertise, to include measures to restore the intelligence community's ability to provide worldwide analytical coverage.

This administration and this Congress are acutely aware of the need for a strong intelligence capability. We on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have done our utmost to give the intelligence agencies what they need to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask all my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge an "aye" vote.

□ 1200

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the accolades and the compliments to our chairman and to our ranking member, who have brought the committee together in a bipartisan way. When we do have differences in the committee, they are settled in an inclusive way and in an intelligent manner that I think benefits the bipartisan nature of the final product. They both do this institution well by their working together.

I also want to thank the staff. The staff has been through an exceedingly difficult year, working in an environment in the United States Capitol that has often been target or a suspected target, has been evacuated a number of times. It is a very difficult environment; and they do an excellent job creating an excellent product, and we are grateful for their hard work.

The intelligence budget and the reforms that are needed are now confronted with three different challenges. Certainly, we have the September 11 challenge, the attack on our country. We have the challenge of changing the culture in the intelligence community over the last 10 years from one that is targeted in an old-fashioned way, guards, guns and gates, to now trying to go after transnational targets, tents, technology, terrorism; and that is a slow and sometimes difficult push into the future.

We also have the difficult challenge of latching up the intelligence with the military capability as we are doing now in Afghanistan. Our intelligence personnel, our intelligence equipment become more and more important in the future.

How do we address that in this bill? We could do it with a quick fix, we could do it with bold reform, or we could construct the platform for

change into the future. We have mostly settled on the latter, platform for change, constructive change; and I think that has been a good, healthy approach. I do, however, wish that we would have taken steps for bold change in two or three areas, like, as our ranking member mentioned, an independent commission to look at what happened on September 11. We have the same people always looking at the same problems, and we do not have enough new eyes on old problems, giving us new solutions.

We need to work more on the information and collaboration in our intelligence community, and we need to look at the cultural changes. Moving to transnational targets, rather than being comfortable going at just other countries' intelligence capability, we need to look at going after biological and chemical weapons and nuclear weapon capabilities of terrorist groups.

We have accomplished a lot, Mr. Speaker. We not only have more money for language and fluency capabilities; we have specifically said that there is congressional interest in this area and the intelligence communities cannot move this money away from language and fluency requirements.

We have improved human intelligence in this bill; and as I said before, we are improving the latching up of the military and the intelligence capabilities.

Finally, our hearts and our prayers go out to Johnny Mike Spann and to Shannon Spann for the sacrifices that they and their family have made and the three children who Shannon now raises with the help of that family.

Support this bipartisan conference report, and we look forward to bolder changes next year.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), who is the chairman of our effort on counter terrorist efforts.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me the time, and I particularly thank him for his strong leadership, along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for bringing this bill to the floor in such great fashion and to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of my committee, for all who have worked in a very bipartisan way to ensure that we are improving our intelligence community. And to the staff, they have been under such great pressure. The staff on both sides of the aisle have worked close together to ensure that we are going to win this battle against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 2883. Yesterday, America paused to remember the terrorist acts that shook our Nation and the many acts of heroism and courage that followed. In the intervening 3 months, America has been fighting back and we are winning.

As the President has said on numerous occasions, this is a war that will extend far beyond the conventional battlefield in Afghanistan; and it is a war that will take years, not days, weeks or months. It is a war that will be fought on American soil and on the soil of our friends and enemies alike. It will be fought in the electronic air waves and the bazaars of the Mideast and north Africa, on the streets of London, Paris, Rome and Bangkok, right across the globe.

Conventional weapons will not be enough to safeguard our public from the long-term threat from terrorism. Smart bombs and Special Forces can only be used against targets that have first been identified as posing a threat.

Intelligence is the weapon most capable of identifying terrorists, their plans and intentions, operating methods, whereabouts and targets of terrorist attack. When 9-11 happened, the world changed but the threat from the terrorists stayed the same. What changed most of all was the recognition that intelligence is critical to our Nation's defense against terror. In fact, a whole new constituency for intelligence has arisen from the ashes of 9-11, and this constituency was far too long in coming.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, I am here to tell the American people that the Intelligence Authorization Act lays the groundwork for fixing many of the problems that have plagued our intelligence professionals. We have sought to address systemic problems within the intelligence community and to begin to correct some of the funding deficiencies of years past that have crippled our ability to achieve true global coverage in intelligence collection and analysis.

This conference report provides the resources and direction necessary to overhaul the intelligence community language training programs and to begin to build a workforce that can operate effectively in the languages and environments used by terrorists. In addition, the report addresses in a more decisive fashion than ever before the chronic shortfall in language exploitation capabilities across the community.

The 9-11 attacks also highlighted shortcomings in the way in which information is shared and analyzed. This conference report provides significant new funding to establish additional joint terrorism task forces across the country, and it enables accelerated construction of analytic capability in the law enforcement, military and intelligence spheres that will aid in untangling the complex of webs of terrorist financing, support, movement, training, and operations, both through enhanced resources and cooperation.

This analytic capability, as a result of the report under consideration, will be applied more rigorously and in a more focused manner to raw threat reporting on terrorism matters. Such

analysis, coupled with direction that the intelligence community establish a reasonable threshold for disseminating raw threat reporting, should vastly improve our ability to make sense of the many scraps of intelligence, real and fabricated, that are collected on a daily basis on terrorist threat activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report and ask that it proceed.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I believe that we have completed our roster of Members who wish to speak on the Democratic side, and I would like to just say in a few closing remarks how appreciative we are to our distinguished chairman for the bipartisan nature of our proceedings, to extend to my Republican colleagues, again, thanks for their cooperation.

I want to acknowledge the good work of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the Democratic members of the committee for their attention to the important work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is like signing up when you join the committee. It is very demanding and Members on both sides have made a strong commitment of time, enthusiasm, and dedication to these important issues so that we can have the force protection that is one of the main goals of intelligence and that we can have mission success on whatever we set out to do.

We talked about human intelligence at the beginning. The chairman mentioned it as a priority in his remarks and I did in mine. We want to commend all of the people who work in the intelligence community, in the human intelligence side, and otherwise, for their courage and their dedication. I also want to note the commitment that our committee has to bringing diversity to our human intelligence.

There are people in our country who understand the language, the cultures, the opportunities in other countries and in other cultures that would serve us well in achieving our mission success and we must draw upon them. Our HUMINT has to look different as we go into the future.

So we recognize and express gratitude to all of them, particularly Mike Spann and the others who lost their lives. We also recognize those who risk their lives every day for freedom in America and to root out terrorism wherever it exists.

I want to commend especially, though, the staff of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence led by Tim Sample on the Republican side. We do



not really call it the Republican side. We really have a bipartisan approach to this. But he is the chief of staff for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I want to acknowledge the Democratic side staff: Mike Sheehy, Wyndee Parker, Beth Larson, Carolyn Bartholomew, Chris Healey for her good work on our issues, Kirk McConnell, Bob Emmett, and Ilene Romack, who work so hard for us.

I want to commend our chairman for his leadership. It was interesting to work with the Senate on this bill. So I commend the chairman, the new Democratic chairman, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator SHELBY for their cooperation as well. With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and I just wanted to finish this with some thoughts about how grateful I am and how privileged I am, indeed honored, to serve with such wonderful members. That is a select committee. And I mean it. We have heard today from the chairman and the ranking members of the four subcommittee we now have because we have so much business on the committee. But the others who did not speak, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), have all contributed mightily to this.

It is obviously a wonderful select committee to have and be able to work with and we are backed up with the kind of staff that we have as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has said, with Mike Sheehy and Tim Sample and Chris Barton, our top staff keeping us on the track. I think we are able to do our job well. And, of course, a big part of that is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been outstanding with her time, her energy, her attention and her leadership when she has one or two other things to do, I understand, in her portfolio of responsibilities as well.

It is a very good situation for us. I think the people of the United States of America sometimes wonder what the job of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is and need to be reassured that today we are talking about advocacy for sure. That is part of our job. We need to make sure that our folks out there have the tools they need to do the job, to do national security.

But the other side of our job is oversight. We do it very diligently and dutifully. And that is to make sure that all of these awesome capabilities are

used in a way that is entirely lawful and within keeping of character of the goals and wishes and the standards of the people of the United States of America.

We do not have a 1-800 number to flash across the bottom of the screen to say if you have a problem. But we are there as your oversight committee, and if there are problems, we are responsible for dealing with them. And I think we take that seriously, very seriously indeed.

Having said all of that, I think that we have with all of this wonderful good will, and responding to the tasks before us, come up with a good piece of legislation which is urgently needed. I see my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), sitting over there. A lot of us have taken credit and heaped praise back and forth on the work that has been done. A lot of the success we are enjoying today that you are seeing on CNN is coming from the hard work of the people who went before us on the oversight committees. And I take my hat off to those people because they too understood the need.

I am very sorry this year my friend Julian Dixon is not with us to be able to see some of the results of some of his hard work, and I know I am joined on that from my colleagues on the other side. Fortunately, there are always people to come along to fill shoes, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has done that so well. Having said that, I urge adoption of this particular conference report.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and commend the conferees and the professional staff for their hard work.

Specifically, I wanted to express my appreciation for the inclusion of the language I offered as an amendment that requires that the Central Intelligence Agency assume 100 percent of the cost of personal liability insurance for certain CIA employees involved in counterterrorism activities.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 years I served with the Central Intelligence Agency. I spent five years overseas engaged in intelligence collection, counter-intelligence and, in some cases, counter-terrorism.

The work was difficult and dangerous. This fact has been reaffirmed by the terrible death of CIA operations officer, Johnny Micheal Spann, who was the first American to die in combat in Afghanistan in the fight against terrorism last week. But at no time did I doubt that my government would protect me from any personal liability if I encountered a lawsuit as a consequence of my professional duties.

Today, I understand that CIA officers engaged in counter-terrorism activities are virtually required to have personal liability insurance; but the CIA pays only half of the premium. What incentive does a CIA Case Officer have to do the job if he or she is subject to liability lawsuits? Why would they take any risks if the government were unwilling to cover the cost of liability?

I understand that I served in a different time. But I did have the backing of my government—100 percent. It is time to give this assurance back to our Case Officers, many of

whom are on the front lines of the war on terrorism.

This is not an original idea. In fact, it was a recommendation of the Report of the National Commission on Terrorism, titled "Countering the Changing Threat of International Terrorism" submitted to Congress in June of 2000.

The report states, "The risk of personal liability arising from actions taken in an official capacity discourages law enforcement and intelligence personnel from taking bold actions to combat terrorism."

Following the tragic events of September 11th, it is apparent that we must do better in our counter-terrorism effort. The least that we can do is guarantee that any CIA officer participating in the war on terrorism will have the full backing of the federal government. They deserve no less.

Passage of this conference report will provide this full backing. It also maintains the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to designate those CIA employees who qualify for this benefit.

Again, I thank the Members and staff of the House and Senate Intelligence committees for their hard work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1215

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2883, the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 311 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 311

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3295) to establish a program to provide funds to States to replace punch card voting systems, to establish the Election Assistance Commission to assist in the administration of Federal elections and to otherwise provide assistance with the administration of certain Federal election laws and programs, to establish minimum election administration standards